

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claims 35, 37, 38, 40, and 44-46 will have been amended, and claims 36, 38-39, and 41-43 remain unamended and pending for consideration by the Examiner. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate and proper.

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided.

Applicant notes with appreciation Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application on May 30, 2000 by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 Form, and for consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has objected to specification, asserting that the title of the invention is not descriptive. In response to the Examiner's requirement, Applicant has amended the title of the invention so as to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the above objection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 35-46 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. By the present amendment, Applicant

P18896.A08

has amended claims 35, 37, 40, and 44-46 to clarify the scope of the inventions and to thus overcome the outstanding rejection. Specifically, the image recording apparatus of the claims has both a copy mode and a facsimile mode. The panel section of e.g. claim 35 has input keys operable to input at least “a numerical value corresponding to the number of copies in the copy mode” and “a numerical value corresponding to a telephone number of a destination in the facsimile mode.” Further, the display section of e.g. claim 35 can display at least “a screen for the copy mode” and “a screen for the facsimile mode.” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Applicant notes that the amendments to claims 35, 37, 40, and 44-46 merely clarify the subject matter recited in the canceled claims, but do not narrow the scope of the claims and thus give rise to no prosecution estoppel.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection and rejection, and an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.


SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has amended the rejected claims for consideration by the Examiner. With respect to the pending claims, Applicant has pointed out the features thereof. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application in due course.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
Masanori KAMATA


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

July 28, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191